BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: NHDOT Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCE: July 19, 2017
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Matt Urban
Sarah Large
Ron Crickard
Mark Hemmerlein
Marc Laurin
Rebecca Martin
Jon Hebert
Susan Klasen
Jennifer Reczek
Sally Gunn

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

ACOE
Mike Hicks

NHDES
Gino Infascelli
Lori Sommer
Stephanie Giallongo

NH Natural Heritage Bureau
Amy Lamb

Consultants/Public Participants
Marc Jacobs
John Parrelli
Will Schoefmann
Pete Walker
Julie Whitmore
Stephanie Micucci
Cassandra Burns
Jennifer Mercer
Darren Blood
Christine Perron

(When viewing these minutes online, click on an attendee to send an e-mail)

PRESENTATIONS/ PROJECTS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:
(minutes on subsequent pages)

(When viewing these minutes online, click on a project to zoom to the minutes for that project)

NOTES ON CONFERENCE:

Finalization May 17th, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Matt Urban asked the group if they had any additional comments for the May 17th, 2017 meeting minutes. BOE had received comments from Jason Trembley, Jim Rousseau, and Carol Henderson. The group did not have any further revisions. The minutes were finalized and posted on the Bureau's website on a subsequent day.

FE Everett Turnpike ATMS, #29408 (Non-Federal)
Marc Jacobs provided an overview of the project. The project involves approximately 35 miles of the Frederick E. Everett Turnpike Corridor from 0.5 miles north of the Massachusetts state line in Nashua to the I-93 Exit 13 interchange in Concord and includes segments of US Route 3, I-293 and I-93. The project proposes seventeen new Intelligent Transportation System field devices (closed-circuit televisions and dynamic message signs) and a new wireless communications network connecting the field devices to the existing NHDOT Transportation Management System. The project is confined to the existing right-of-way and shoulders with a couple exceptions in Bow and Concord to access utilities.

Five locations involve flood plain, none involve the floodway. None of the locations will measurably increase the base flood elevation, adversely impact the floodplain or pose significant risk to life or property. One location (I-93 36.8) falls within ¼ mile of the (upper) portion of the Merrimack which is designated under NH RSA 483. Two other locations fall within 250 feet of the Merrimack and thus are subject to RSA 483:B, the Shoreland Water Quality Protection Act. Gino Infascelli has spoken to Darlene Forst and indicated that the NHDES would not assert jurisdiction for the two 3 ft. x 3 ft. pads to be placed adjacent to the highway.

The Natural Heritage Bureau has been contacted and indicated that there are sensitive species in the area and that they have no concern that the project will result in any impact. Since this is a state-funded project we have not contacted the US Fish and Wildlife Service regarding endangered species. Ron Crickard indicated that we should contact them. The project has no direct impacts to jurisdictional wetlands. The project does not involve any work on bridges that span navigable waterways so no Coast Guard permit is necessary. The corridor has been reviewed for potential contamination sites near proposed ATMS and none are immediately adjacent so there are no concerns.

Michael Hicks asked if any fill was being proposed in wetlands or any cables over waterways. None is being proposed. Some of the work will be located on steep slopes and embankments and wetlands or drainage infrastructure is nearby so customary perimeter siltation controls are being proposed. Michael Hicks asked if the project would result in more than an acre of alteration. The project will not trigger the one acre threshold of earth disturbance requiring permit coverage under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System – Construction General Permit. Gino Infascelli asked about the size of the bases for the poles and other structures. The bases will be 3-4 feet in diameter typically.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Keene, #29340 (Non-Federal)
John Parrelli started the meeting with some background information:

During the last meeting on February 15, 2017 he (John Parrelli) presented the repair and replace alternatives of the proposed project. Since then, the City of Keene has decided on the complete replacement option and is looking for buy-in from the agencies.

Complete replacement consists of:

- Concrete arch (28 ft span), two - 12 ft lanes, center turn lane matching other sections of corridor.
- Plan to add 5 ft wide sidewalks and 5 ft wide shoulders along the project corridor.
- Within the 100 year flood zone.
- Temporary bridge alternating traffic during construction due of volume of traffic through the area.
- 1500 sq ft wetland impacts, 1500 sq ft bank impacts (most likely permanent) and 80-90 linear ft of channel impacts with proposed rip rap along the wing walls. Current proposed impacts; NOT final design.
- Construction to start next season

Mike Hicks asked if the project could limit work from March to November. John Parrelli noted that would be an acceptable requirement.

Mike Hicks asked if there would be cutting of trees over 3 inches in regards to Northern Long Eared Bats. John Parrelli responded that there is one tree that may need to be trimmed for the temporary bridge. Consultation for bats with ACOE will be required.

Mike Hicks also stated concern with other flood storage projects in the area. Mike will review if there are any other projects in the region.

Matt Urban said that we should anticipate mitigation for new work to the banks and channel. Lori Sommer agreed, although possibly not for riprap.

The question was asked on how flow was going to be managed during construction? John Parrelli responded that since the proposed concrete arch is wider, it could be built on the outside of the existing box culvert and that sand bags could be used to help divert flow.

Gino Infascelli noted that he reviewed aerials of the project area and thought the need for a center lane on the bridge seemed excessive. He further inquired, how will the numerous driveways be handled, especially in terms of sidewalks and drainage? Specifically, what will you be doing for treatment for extra impervious?

John Parrelli noted that there will be curb adjacent to the sidewalk along the project corridor. He also noted that there are some locations for potential treatment areas but we won't be able to contact land owners in regards to ROW until after the Engineering Study.
Gino Infascelli commented that the increased width of the bridge will require mitigation due to the increased impacts to the channel and banks.

Gino Infascelli asked who did the wetland delineation. John Parrelli answered, Russ Huntley of SVE Associates.

This project has been previously discussed at the 2/15/2017 Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meetings.

Keene, #40439 (X-A004(408))
John Parrelli provided an overview of the project, noting that we are in the Engineering Study phase of the project.

The proposal of the preferred alternative are described below:

Trail Sections:

- Cheshire Rail Trail - existing trail is in good shape so it is proposed to put in a 10' wide 4" stone dust surface.
- Ami Brown section is a little rougher and contains stones on the surface. It is proposed to excavate and add 6" of gravel with 4" of stone dust on top (10' width)

Roadway Sections:

- Summit Ridge Road
  - Install sharrows (pavement markings)
- Summit Road: Summit Ridge Rd. – Hastings Ave.
  - 10 ft. lanes w/ gravel shared use path
- Summit Road: Hastings Ave. – Park Ave.
  - Existing sidewalk +10 ft. lanes w/ 4 ft. bike lanes
- Park Ave.:
  - Existing sidewalk + 10 ft. lanes w/ 4 ft. bike lanes
- West Street (Route 9 underpass):
  - Install sharrows (pavement markings)

John Parrelli noted that the Engineering Study will be submitted in July or August. Construction will begin next season.

Matt Urban asked if there are any wetland impacts. John Parrelli, answered that yes, there are wetland impacts on the rail trail. They amount to approximately 1500 sq ft of permanent wetland impacts:

- A ditch line with wetlands along the rail trail (to the east) will be impacted due to widening. This is north of the cross connection to Ami Brown Road.
- There is a wetland on Ami Brown Road near the intersection with Summit Ridge Drive where a 36" pipe appears to have been removed and moved to the side. The project plans to place a new pipe in the crossing.
- An existing 12" CMP on Ami Brown Road will be replaced with a 15" pipe. The replacement and widening in this area will require some impacts to the wetlands at this location.

Mike Hicks asked if there will be any cutting of trees. John Parrelli noted there will be trimming/cutting of some trees. It was noted that any trimming and cutting will need to be coordinated to avoid bats' breeding times.

Amy Lamb said there was a hit for the wood turtle and said she is happy to see we are using stone dust and not paving but it still requires coordination with Fish & Game to see if they have additional questions or recommendations (A F&G representative was not present at the meeting). John Parrelli said we will follow up on the wood turtles.

Ron Crickard commented that IPaC now has a review tool for the Northern Long Eared Bats. Please include Tom Jamison on it as he will need to submit to Federal Highway.

Gino Infascelli asked about who performed the wetland delineation? John Parrelli answered, Russ Huntley of SVE Associates.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Dummer, #16304A (X-A001(146))

Mark Hemmerlein introduced the project and indicated that the project is at the end of preliminary design and that VHB was hired to finish the design and apply for permits. The Department was up in Dummer this spring to collect public input and the design that will be presented is a result of the design consideration and public input.

Frank from VHB presented the proposed layout. This included a short section of on-alignment improvements from NH route 110A over Robbins Brook. The alignment will shift approximately 50 feet to the west from about a mile and then merge back on alignment prior to Dummer Pond Road. The proposed roadway will be raised approximately 3 feet and existing roadway will be graded to provide a vegetated treatment area. The advertising is currently scheduled for September 2018 with permit applications by fall of 2017.

The project area was acoustically screened for bats with no returns of endangered long eared bats. There were a few NHB migratory reports which will be reviewed with NH Fish and Game

Palustrine wetland impacts are proposed to exceed 6 acres. There are three stream crossing; Robbins Brook to the south and two smaller un-named brooks. There are no anticipated impacts to the Androscoggin River or its banks. The existing culverts that carry water under existing NH Route 16 are proposed to be removed.

Mike H asked if the amount of wetland impacts bumps this project from a Categorical Exclusion to an Environmental Assessment. Ron indicated this project should still qualify for a CE. Jennifer stated that the total project cost was around $4M as presented and the advertising is scheduled for next year.

There was a discussion about the wetland mitigation. The ARM fund payment for the impacts would be around $1M. Lori suggested DOT look around for mitigation property to purchase and check with F&G for possible conservation lands. Matt suggested the mitigation should be reduced since the Department is making an effort to move the roadway away from the Androscoggin River and restore the river bank environment. Gino and Lori indicated they would not credit the Departments since it is not wetland replacement. We also discussed applying funds to the Stream Passage Improvement program. She wanted to meet to discuss the mitigation further.

There was a discussion of a 2.5 ft. box culvert on Muzzy Hill Rd. that might be a component of the mitigation.

This project has been previously discussed at the 10/15/2014 Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meetings.

Portsmouth-New Castle, #41253 (X-A004(574))

Julie Whitmore summarized the project, which involves the rehabilitation of two bridges (Bridge No. 241/053 and 031/142) in the City of Portsmouth and the Town of New Castle, respectively, on NH 1B over

the Piscataqua Estuary. The existing bridges were constructed in 1955. They are multi-span bridges with three continuous segments per bridge. The superstructure consists of steel girders and concrete deck. Anchor piers at the ends of continuous segments consist of a concrete pile cap and steel H-piles. Intermediate piles are steel pile bents and abutments are pile supported concrete stub abutments. The bridges share similar details and vary only in overall length: Bridge No. 241/053 is 540 feet long and Bridge No. 031/142 is 480 feet long.

Previous maintenance on both bridges includes:

- 1978 – Bridge painting
- 1986 – Replaced expansion joints, added concrete pile jackets, new steel bridge railing, reconstructed walkways, new scuppers, deck shoulder reconstruction, partial deck overlay, barrier membrane, pavement.
- 2008 – Replaced concrete pile jackets, cathodic protection system, and miscellaneous other repairs.
- 2011 – Bridge painting
-

The purpose of this project is to maintain and preserve the remaining life of both bridges. Repairs in this contract include new expansion joints, concrete repairs, miscellaneous steel repairs, address undermined western Portsmouth abutment, mill and overlay, approach walkway repairs, and gravel shoulder grading in New Castle.

Pete Walker discussed the environmental resources associated with the project and emphasized that the project is a repair to an existing structure. Work will be within the footprint of the existing roadway and bridge, within existing right-of-way. There would be no expansion of pavement or other impervious surfaces, but approximately 0.4 mile of NH 1B would be repaved as part of the project. No alteration of any bank, flat, wetland, surface water, or undeveloped TBZ.

Excavation is limited to existing roadbed and sidewalk features. An erosion control plan will be submitted with natural buffer perimeter controls around excavation limits. Temporary impacts to the Developed Tidal Buffer Zone (DTBZ) are 1,632 square feet for excavation for the abutment and approach walkway work and permanent impacts are 800 square feet for the gravel fill. VHB delineated Highest Observable Tide Line (HOTL) in 2017.

Mike Hicks asked if all work would occur above HOTL. Pete and Julie confirmed. Mike confirmed ACOE permit is not required for this project.

Jamie Sikora asked about cultural resource impacts - are the bridges exempt from Section 106? Pete confirmed that the project has been reviewed and approved under the Programmatic Agreement as an Appendix B project.

Pete confirmed all rare species coordination with the NH Natural Heritage Bureau and the US Fish and Wildlife Service is complete and there are no concerns.

Jamie asked if the walkways on approaches would need to be modified to be compliant with ADA regulations. Julie explained that the walkways are approximately 30 feet long beyond the bridge. John explained that the referenced “walkways” are an early version of brush curbs and although they are not sidewalks, fisherman use the 2’-8” width to fish from. The 30’ approaches are in place to provide a safe transition to the bridge brush curbs for vehicular traffic.

Pete intends to submit the wetland application as a minimum impact. Gino confirmed that as long as impacts are confined to previously developed TBZ then the project should qualify as a minimum impact. Gino commented that any work within 100 feet of the HOTL including fill needs a DES permit.

Matt Urban asked if G&C was required. Gino confirmed that only major impact projects in public water require G&C approval.

Jamie Sikora inquired about 4(f) evaluation for the gravel parking area that is used as a pull off for kayaks (recreational 4(f)). Pete explained that the improvement was requested by the Town Selectmen.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Claremont, #25621 (X-A002(909))

Cassandra Burns briefly described the project and discussed the potential environmental impacts of the project. A Shoreland Permit By Notification will be needed due to the proximity of The Sugar River. No other environmental permits are required. The project will reconfigure an existing drainage swale to treat the runoff from a proposed new driveway and adds an earth berm at its outlet to retain stormwater for treatment. All concurred that there were no concerns with the project.

This project has been previously discussed at the 9/16/2015 Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meetings.

North Hampton, #24457 (X-A002(909)

Darren Blood introduced the project. This is the second time this project has been presented at the Natural Resource Agency meeting. The project proposes to replace the superstructure of the US Route 1 Bridge (148/132) over the former B&M Railroad and to improve the North Road intersections that are located approximately 300' apart to the north and south of the bridge. The bridge is on the 2016 Red List as Bridge Priority #28. US Route 1 is a Minor Urban Arterial. The construction period for the project is dependent on the traffic control method employed. A short-term closure of US Route 1 with the use of Accelerated Bridge Construction techniques is possible instead of standard phased construction. The project is currently scheduled to advertise in 2020 but could be moved up to 2019. The estimated construction cost is $4.1 million.

Jennifer Mercer provided additional details on the proposed design. US Route 1 is posted for 45mph with one travel lane in the north and south directions and a tapering center lane throughout the project limits. The North Hampton Police Department has documented 18 accidents in the last 6 years at the North Road/US Route 1 intersections. The project proposes to relocate the intersections of North Road (West) and North Road (East) with US Route 1, and make adjustments to the roadway profile to provide a flatter, longer approach to each intersection.

The existing intersections are approximately 300' apart and the proposed improvements would place them 800' apart. North Road (East) was moved to the north to increase the separation with North Road (West) and make the drive at Golf Center work. US Route 1 through the project area has 12' travel lanes, a center turn lane of approximately 10', and shoulders that vary from 2' to 3'. The proposed typical section consists of 12' travel lanes and center turn lane, with 4' or 5' shoulders for improved safety. This results in an increase in impervious area of about 13,000 square feet. Pavement along the abandoned portion of

North Road (East) will be removed. US Route 1 profile adjustments will be minor and improvements will be accomplished with step-box widening. North Road (West) and North Road (East) will be full depth reconstruction. The existing paved area surface drainage sheet flows from the roadway with no closed drainage. Sections of US Route 1 north of the bridge will be curbed with closed drainage to collect runoff for treatment.

Christine Perron provided an overview of proposed impacts. When the project was last reviewed, it was thought that wetland impacts could be avoided. Since that meeting, the alignment of North Road (East) has been modified to improve its geometry and profile. This change in alignment will result in impacts to the palustrine wetland located on the north side of North Road (East). Total wetland impacts will be approximately 17,000 square feet. Of that total, approximately 1,700 square feet of impact will be to a small open water wetland located within the larger forested/scrub-shrub wetland. The proposed slope will result in filling the entire open water wetland and the corner of a larger wetland complex that extends beyond the project area. Proposed impacts exceed the mitigation threshold. The Department's preference is to provide mitigation through an ARM fund payment. The local Conservation Commission has not yet been contacted for input on potential mitigation.

As noted at the previous meeting, there are no stream crossings, floodplains, or protected shoreland areas within the project. Section 106 consultation on historic resources is ongoing, and an Adverse Effect determination is anticipated.

The project is in an MS4 regulated community, which will require that 80% of total suspended solids (TSS) and 50% of total phosphorus (TP) be removed from all post-project pavement (all existing pavement plus the 0.3 acre of additional pavement). Potential locations for stormwater treatment have been located on project plans. The design of the treatment areas will take place after the Public Hearing during Final Design.

The bridge will be examined for evidence of bat roosting. The project is expected to qualify for review under the FHWA/USFWS Programmatic Consultation. The State endangered slender blue iris has been identified in the field along North Road (West). A few stems were identified in the field during the wetland delineation; this plant was not found in any other wetlands in the project area. Impacts to the field where this species is located are not anticipated.

Lori Sommer asked if the open water wetland is a vernal pool. C. Perron replied that water is present throughout the year. There is no defined stream channel entering the ponded area but there is a culvert under North Road from this open water wetland to a non-jurisdictional ditch. The pond does not appear to be man-made (by excavation) but could be the result of water accumulating due to a blocked or undersized culvert.

L. Sommer agreed that mitigation would be required for impacts as proposed. She asked that the community (Conservation Commission) and the Southeast Land Trust be contacted for input on potential local projects that may be appropriate for mitigation.

Amy Lamb asked if the pond was checked for slender blue iris. C. Perron replied that it wasn't possible to walk the perimeter of the ponded area during the delineation but no iris leaves could be seen from the road. She would check again when she is at the project area within the next few weeks.

Mike Hicks confirmed that the project is expected to qualify for authorization under the NH Programmatic General Permit.

Matt Urban asked if wetland impacts could be reduced below the mitigation threshold by steepening slopes and using guardrail. D. Blood replied that this was looked at and impacts would still be over 10,000 square feet.

No further questions or concerns were raised with the project as presented.

This project has been previously discussed at the 6/15/2016 monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.